

**Remarks**

Claims 1, 7, 12 and 17 have been amended to clarify that the handpiece is on the housing.

A terminal disclaimer and fee are enclosed to overcome the double patenting rejection.

With regard to the obviousness rejections, Applicant has amended the claims to clarify the relationship between (i) the reflective light collecting device that collects light from one or more light emitting semiconductor chips and presents that light as an unfocused beam to a focusing lens, (ii) a focusing lens that focuses the light into a focused light beam, and (iii) a light transport device that transports the focused light to a curing location. None of the prior art suggest the claimed sequential combination of a light collecting device for collecting unfocused light and presenting it to a focusing lens, a focusing lens for focusing the light and presenting it to a light transport device, and a light transport device. Consequently the assembled prior art references do not constitute a *prima facie* obviousness case.

In view of these reasons, withdrawal of the obviousness rejections is requested.

Favorable reconsideration of the patent application is requested.

Respectfully submitted this 10th day of June, 2004.



Daniel P. McCarthy  
Reg. No. 36,600  
PARSONS, BEHLE & LATIMER  
201 South Main Street, Suite 1800  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111  
(801) 532-1234